

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed March 2, 2007, claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-20 and 41 have been rejected, claims 11 and 12 have objected to, and claim 42 has been allowed. In response, the Applicants have submitted the following remarks, amended claims 1, 12, and 41 and cancelled claims 9 and 11. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-20 and 41-42 are now pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Within the Office Action, it is stated that claim 42 is allowed. Furthermore, it is stated that claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the Applicants have cancelled claim 11, and intervening claim 9, and amended the limitations from these two dependent claims into the independent claim 1. Furthermore, the Applicants have amended claim 12 to now depend upon the independent claim 1. Per the Examiner's Office Action, claim 1 is now allowable over Lozier as it includes the limitations of claim 11 and intervening claim 9. Accordingly, claim 12 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Lastly, the Applicants have amended the independent claim 41 to include the limitations of claims 11 and 12. Independent claim 41 already included the limitations of the intervening claim 9. For at least these reasons, claim 41 is also allowable over Lozier.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102/§103**

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9, 13 and 15-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated or, in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0230456 to Lozier et al. (hereinafter Lozier).

Further, within the Office Action, claims 11 and 12 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if re-written in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the above amendment, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 11 and intervening claim 9. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lozier.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 13, and 15-20 are dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lozier. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 13, and 15-20 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 6, 8 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lozier. Claims 3, 6, 8 and 14 are dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lozier. Accordingly, claims 3, 6, 8 and 14 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 10 and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lozier in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0050538 to Nagihavi et al. (hereinafter Nagihavi). Claim 10 is dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lozier. Accordingly, claim 10 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim. As discussed above, the independent claim 41 is allowable as it includes allowable subject matter.


The independent claim 41 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 11 and 12. Accordingly, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lozier and Naghavi.

Application No. 10/824,983  
Amendment Dated March 13, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of March 2, 2007

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at 414-271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By:   
Christopher M. Scherer  
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceaux, Starke & Sawall, LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, St. 1100  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
(414) 271-7590  
Attorney Docket No. 146462 (5024-00124)